

REMARKS

In response to the final Office Action dated May 29, 2008, the Assignee respectfully requests continued examination and reconsideration based on the above amendments and on the following remarks.

Claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, and 17-24 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 4, 17, and 20-24, however, were withdrawn from consideration by restriction. Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, and 16 have been, or previously were, canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Rejection of Claims under § 103 (a)

Claims 1, 5-8, 10-11, 13-16, and 18-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over AU Patent No. 200223,231 to Nagle *et al.* in view of U.S. 6,042,080 to Shepherd *et al.* and further in view of U.S. 6,158,555 to Brown Jr.,

First, claims 5, 7, 14, and 16 have been canceled, so the rejection of these claims is moot.

Next, the proposed combination of *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown* does not obviate claims 1, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15, and 18-19. These claims recite, or incorporate, features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown*. Independent claim 1, for example, recites “*a cable receptacle attached to an end portion of a final segment of the telescopic segments*.” Support for such features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraph [0020]. Independent claim 1 also recites “*a control system installed in the base and operatively associated with the cable drop support system*.” Support for such features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraph [0021]. Independent claim 1 also recites “*at least one mechanical drive mechanism connected to the final segment of the telescopic segments and operatively coupled to respond to the control system, the at least one mechanical drive mechanism configured to at least one of extend and retract the final segment*.” Support for such features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraphs [0020] and [0021]. Independent claim 1 also recites “*an electric generator power source providing electric power*

to the cable drop support system to cause extension and retraction of the telescopic segments from the instructions received from the control system.” Support for such features may be found at least in the as-filed application at paragraph [0023]. Independent claim 1 is reproduced below, and independent claim 19 recites similar features.

1. A cable drop support system comprising:

 a base configured for attachment to an attachment surface, the base including at least one attachment device, wherein the attachment device is an adhesive that adheres the base to the attachment surface;

 one or more telescopic segments connected to the base that extend and retract in length in a telescoping configuration;

 a cable receptacle attached to an end portion of a final segment of the telescopic segments, the cable receptacle having a generally U-shaped cross-section for receiving therein at least an intermediate portion of a cable;

 a control system installed in the base and operatively associated with the cable drop support system, the control system configured for receiving instructions communicated through at least one wireless communication media;

 a portable communication device configured to provide instructions to the control system through the at least one wireless communication media;

 at least one mechanical drive mechanism connected to the final segment of the telescopic segments and operatively coupled to respond to the control system, the at least one mechanical drive mechanism configured to at least one of extend and retract the final segment; and

 an electric generator power source providing electric power to the cable drop support system to cause extension and retraction of the telescopic segments from the instructions received from the control system.

The proposed combination of *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown* does not obviate all these features. *Nagle* discloses a telescopic cable support. *Shepherd* discloses a telescopic post having a magnetic base. *Brown* discloses a telescopic mast that extends and retracts from a vehicle. Still, though, the combined teaching of *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown* fails to teach or suggest all the claimed features. *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown*, for example, fails to teach or suggest “*a control system installed in the base and operatively associated with the cable drop support system*” (emphasis added). *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and

Brown fails to teach or suggest “*at least one mechanical drive mechanism connected to the final segment of the telescopic segments and operatively coupled to respond to the control system, the at least one mechanical drive mechanism configured to at least one of extend and retract the final segment.*” Even though *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown* may disclose a telescopic mast and a control panel, *Brown* is entirely silent to this claimed structure. Moreover, *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown* also fail to teach or suggest “*an electric generator power source providing electric power to the cable drop support system to cause extension and retraction of the telescopic segments from the instructions received from the control system.*” The proposed combination of *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown*, quite simply, is entirely silent to how *Brown*’s telescopic mast is extended and retracted.

The proposed combination of *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown*, then, cannot obviate the pending claims. Independent claims 1 and 19 recite many features that are not disclosed or suggested by *Nagle*, *Shepherd*, and *Brown*. The dependent claims incorporate these same features and recite additional features. Claims 1, 6-8, 10-11, 13, 15, and 18-19, then, cannot be anticipated, so the Office is respectfully requested to remove the § 103 (a) rejection of these claims.

If any questions arise, the Office is requested to contact the undersigned at (919) 469-2629 or scott@scottzimmerman.com.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott P. Zimmerman
Attorney for the Assignee
Reg. No. 41,390